

**JUL 31 2006**

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**

**CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS**

**FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

JOSE LUIS LARA-JAIMES; et al.,

Petitioners,

v.

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, Attorney  
General,

Respondent.

No. 05-74875

Agency Nos. A75-766-171  
A75-766-172

MEMORANDUM\*

On Petition for Review of an Order of the  
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted July 24, 2006\*\*

Before: ALARCÓN, HAWKINS, and THOMAS, Circuit Judges.

Jose Luis Lara-Jaimes and Crispina Diaz-Rodriguez, natives and citizens of Mexico, petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("Board")

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and may not be cited to or by the courts of this circuit except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

\*\* The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

dismissal of their appeal of an immigration judge's denial of their applications for cancellation of removal. We dismiss the petition for review.

We lack jurisdiction to review the Board's discretionary determination that petitioners failed to demonstrate exceptional and extremely unusual hardship. *See Romero-Torres v. Ashcroft*, 327 F.3d 887, 890 (9th Cir. 2003). Petitioners' contentions regarding the agency's weighing of evidence and its failure to mention certain Board precedent in its decisions do not state a colorable due process claim. *See Martinez-Rosas v. Gonzales*, 424 F.3d 926, 930 (9th Cir. 2005) (“[t]raditional abuse of discretion challenges recast as alleged due process violations do not constitute colorable constitutional claims that would invoke our jurisdiction.”).

Petitioners' request that we refer this case to mediation in light of pending immigration legislation is denied.

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED.**